



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

BY M. H. SEGAL, Oxford.

III

SOME NOTES ON THE TEXT.¹

I. 1. 6. BUDDE capriciously deletes this verse, and also בן תכעיסנה in ver. 7, thereby robbing the story of much of its humaneness and picturesqueness. As a matter of fact the provocation by Peninah is intended by the narrator as an explanation of the excessive grief displayed by Hannah. The phraseology of this verse is referred to again in ver. 16 b.

7. I would suggest that יעשה is used here as an impersonal verb in the sense of היה 'to happen'. This would enable us to retain עלתה of the MT which rightly makes both clauses of the verse refer to Hannah.

8. The critics accept the addition of LXX in the verse and read . . . חנה ותאמר לו הנני אדני ויאמר לה למה תבכי. 'The clause is . . . according to 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16 characteristic of the narrative' (Budde in his Notes to his Polychrome text in Haupt's *SBOT.*, p. 52). But the response הנני is generally used, as in the examples cited from ch. 3, only in answer to a call from some distance, and is altogether unsuitable here, where Elkanah and Hannah sat at the same table and probably side by side. The addition in LXX is merely an expansion by the translator similar to the expansion in vv. 5, 6.

ירע is certainly correct. Cf. the opposite טוב לב, 25. 36;

¹ Cf. vol. IX, pp. 43 ff.

II 13. 28, &c. The reading of LXX יֵכָן (τύπτει σέ), which H. P. Smith (p. 8) prefers, can only mean: 'why art thou remorseful?' (cf. 24. 6, and Driver's note here), viz. for her sins, on account of which God had presumably denied her children. But whereas Elkanah could see by her sad looks that she was grieved at heart, how could he have divined that her grief was due to remorse?

16. Targum, Rashi, and Kimḥi refer בַּת בִּלְעֵל to Peninah, and interpret אֵל תֵּתֵן 'Give me not up for a reproach' (לֹא תְכַלִּים). But the narrator would no doubt have expressed the idea rather differently, or would have at least added the necessary complement לְחַרְפָּה (cf. Joel 2. 17; and see Driver's note).

18. Budde and others accept the conflate text of LXX: וְחָלַק הָאִשָּׁה לְדֶרֶכָה וְתָבֵא הַלְשָׁכָתָהּ וְתֹאכַל. But if Hannah went only as far as the לְשָׁכָה, which must have been attached to the sanctuary, the narrator would not have described it as לְדֶרֶכָה 'she went *away*'.

For LXX has συνέπτεσεν, which is probably a paraphrase reminiscent of Gen. 4. 5, 6. The phrase in MT, though without parallel elsewhere, may nevertheless be as genuine a Hebrew idiom as the very rare expression in Gen. 4. 6. Klostermann and Budde read הַפִּילָה, citing Jer. 3. 12. But there the phrase means 'to display vindictive anger against somebody', a sense quite unsuitable here.

22. The traditional pointing וַיִּרְאָה as a *Niph'al* here and elsewhere, wherever this ritual expression occurs, has been vindicated by Schorr (*Monatschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft d. Judentums*, 1909, p. 438 f.). The pointing of this verb as a *kal* is here entirely excluded by the fact that the construction demands the perfect consecutive tense, like the preceding and following verbs.

2. 1-10. THE SONG OF HANNAH.

1. For עלץ Targum has תקיף, and LXX ἐστερεώθη, and Peshitta حَجَّ. This points to an original reading אָמַן, which seems preferable to the MT עלץ. For אָמַן לָבִי forms a better parallel to רַמָּה קִרְנִי and רַחֵב פִּי than לָבִי עלץ. Similarly in the conclusion of the poem we have the idea of strength made parallel to the exaltation of the horn: וְיִרְם קֶרֶן || וְיִתֵּן עוֹ. Further, עלץ לָבִי does not form a logical antecedent to כִּי שִׁמְחָתִי, since the ideas of the two clauses are practically identical. Cf. also Aptowitzer, *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur*, II, 4. For the second בִּיהוּה we should read בְּאֱלֹהֵי, as in many MSS. LXX and Vulg. Cf. Aptowitzer, I, 37.

2. I suspect that כִּי אֵין בְּלִתֵּךְ is a gloss. The line is one word shorter than the other lines of the poem. Further, the statement is inconsistent with the rest of the verse. For if there is no existence besides God, it is impossible to institute a comparison between Him and any other being. Again, with the exception of בִּישׁוּעִתֵּךְ in ver. 1, God is throughout the poem spoken of in the third person. The clause must have been originally an ejaculation of some pious reader, written in the margin, and directed against the false inference which might be drawn from the poet's words that there may be in existence a holy being or a 'rock', though not of the same exalted holiness or strength as God Himself.

3. The second נִבְהָה should be deleted as a ditto-graphy, which renders the line too long.

5. Since J. Reifman עַר has been rightly joined to the preceding verb, thus giving the line the same number of words as most other lines of the poem. This עַר is usually emended into עָבַר. I think רָעַב would be more suitable.

10. I accept Budde's excellent emendation of עליו בשמים into עליון בשר ירעם. The last two lines of the poem ירעם . . . משיחו are a later liturgical addition, suggested by the first two lines (ver. 1 a $\beta\gamma$.² So already Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 57. The poem, though almost wholly of a didactic nature, may have been employed in the liturgy at an early period, when a prayer was added to it for the prosperity of the king.

We are now in a position to determine the form and construction of our poem. The poem consists of four strophes. Strophe I has two verses, the first a tetrastich of which the first three lines are synonymous, and the fourth synthetic (ver. 1), and the second a distich of synonymous lines (ver. 2). Strophe II has three verses. The first verse is a tetrastich in which the first line is synonymous to the second line, the third line synonymous to the fourth line, the second couplet being synthetic to the first couplet (ver. 3). The second verse is a tetrastich in which the first line is antithetical to the second line, the third line antithetical to the fourth line, the first couplet being synonymous to the second couplet (vv. 4-5 a). The third verse is a distich of antithetical lines. Strophe III has also three verses. The first verse is a tetrastich in which the first line is synonymous to the second, and the third synonymous to the fourth line, the first couplet being synonymous to the second couplet (vv. 6-7). The second verse is likewise a tetrastich of synonymous lines, but the second couplet is synthetic to the first couplet (ver. 8 a). The last verse is, like the last verse in the two previous strophes, a distich, the lines of which are, however, synthetic (ver. 8 b). Strophe IV consists, like strophe I, of but two

² Cf. this Review, vol. VI, p. 557 (§ 34).

verses, with this difference, that both verses are tristichs. In the first verse the first line is antithetical to the second line, and both are synthetic to the third line (ver. 9). In the second verse the first line is synonymous to the second line, and the third line is recapitulatory (ver. 10 a). The lines in the poem are throughout trimetric with the exception of the last line in each of the two verses in strophe IV, which has four stresses.

We will now set out the whole text of the poem arranged in accordance with this description:

III.

1. יהוה ממית ומחיה
מוריר שאול ויעל
יהוה מוריש ומעשיר
משפיל אף מרוםם.

2. מקים מעפר דל
מאשפת ירים אביון
להושיב עם נדיבים
וכסא כבוד ינחלם.

3. כִּי־לִיהוֹה מַצְקִי אֶרֶץ
וַיֵּשֶׁת עֲלֵיהֶם תִּבְלָה.

IV.

1. רגלי חסידו ישמר
ורשעים בחשך ידמו
כִּי־לֹא בָנָה יִגְבֵּר אִישׁ.

2. יהוה יחתו מריבו
עליון בשמים ירעם
יהוה ידין אפסי ארץ.

[ויתן עז למלכו
וירם קרן משיחו].

I.

1. אָמֵן לְבִי בִיהוֹה
רַמָּה קִרְנִי בָאֱלֹהִי
רַחֵב פִּי עַל־אֹיְבֵי
כִּי שִׁמַּחְתִּי בִישׁוּעֶתְךָ.

קִרְיַשׁ כִּיהוֹה
[כִּי אֵין בִּלְתָּד]
וְאֵין צוּר כְּאַלְהֵינוּ.

II.

1. אֶל־תִּרְבּוּ תִרְבְּרוּ גִבְהָה (גִּבְהָה)

יֵצֵא עֵתָק מִפִּיכֶם
כִּי־אֵל דְּעוֹת יְהוֹה
וְלֹא נִתְכַּנּוּ עֲלֵלוֹת.

2. קֶשֶׁת גִּבְרִים חֲתִים
וּנְכַשְׁלִים אֲזָרוּ חֵיל
שִׁבְעִים בִּלְחָם נִשְׁכְּרוּ
וְרַעֲבִים חֲדָלוּ רָעַב (?).

3. עֲקָרָה יִלְדָה שִׁבְעָה
וּרְבַת בָּנִים אִמְלָלָה.

2. 29. LXX offers no justification for the curious reading of some critics: למה הבטח . . . צויתי מעוין. The phrase of some critics: למה הבטח has no parallel elsewhere, and is altogether un-Hebraic. The original Hebrew of the LXX was the same as in MT, only in some disorder. תבעטו the translator read as תביט, and צויתי מעוין (אשר) as the familiar עין עין.

36. For ספחני LXX has παράψον, evidently connecting it with ספיה (Lev. 25. 5), 'seed poured out involuntarily'.

4. 2. For ותטש many moderns read after LXX (κ. ἐκλινεν) ותט. But the expression is not found elsewhere, and it conveys no intelligible idea. The MT is no doubt correct. The verb may, perhaps, be taken in an intransitive sense as suggested by R. Jonah Ibn Janaḥ in his *Book of Roots* (Hebrew edition by W. Bacher, p. 303): 'the battle spread itself out'. It is better to take it in a transitive sense with an implicit object, viz. the warriors, as correctly paraphrased by Targum, וארטישו עברי קרבא. Cf. the passive and reflexive applied to warriors in 30. 16, and II 5. 18, 22; Judges 15. 9 with the Targum *ad loc.*

7. The original reading seems to have been בא (= באו) אלהים אלהים אל המ'. The word אלהים dropped out from MT through haplography (אלהים = אלהים). The fear of the Philistines was not due to the mere fact that the Deity had come to the scene of battle, but rather to the fact that the Deity had come to the Israelites, and not to them. The conflate reading which some moderns derive from LXX: אלה אלהיהם באו אלהים אל המ' is certainly wrong. The question of the Philistines was not 'What is the Ark?' that the answer should be 'These are their gods who have come unto them.' The question was, 'What is the cause of the great shout?' (ver. 6 a), and to this they have already

received an answer in ver. 6 b. The reading אלהים as in MT is supported by ver. 8. This does not necessarily mean in the mouth of the Philistines the absolute 'God', but merely *a god*. Further, we have to remember that we are really dealing with the words of a Hebrew writer, though they are ascribed to the Philistines. (ὁ θεός) αὐτῶν in LXX, L is probably a scribal addition, while אלה (οὐτοὶ or οὗτος) is probably merely a dittography of אלהים.

8. במרבר is difficult. Perhaps the narrator put it deliberately into the mouth of the Philistines to show their ignorance. The emendation וברבר cannot be right, since בכל מכה includes also דבר. It is to be noted that R. Isaiah and Ralbag would read וַבמרבר, as in LXX and Pesh.

13. The correct reading is with all moderns ליד חשער ליר מצפה הדרך as in LXX; cf. also Targum here with Targum in II 18. 4. See Driver's note *ad loc.* H. P. Smith (*ibid.* 35) asserts that the gate meant is the gate of the Sanctuary (cf. I. 9): for, if it was the gate of the city, then Eli would have received the tidings before the people within the city. But this shows a total misunderstanding of our passage. The repetition of the verb in this verse (ויבא . . . בא) indicates that at his entry into the city the messenger saw Eli sitting and anxiously watching by the roadside for news (ויבא והנה . . .). But the messenger evidently had not the heart to break the sad news to the old priest, and so he passed him by and went into the city (והאיש בא . . .). Eli, however, had not seen the man owing to his blindness (ver. 15). But when he had inquired for the cause of the outcry in the city, then the messenger hastened back to bring him the tidings. It will thus be seen that the parenthetical ver. 15 is necessary to the under-

standing of the narrative, and is therefore an original part of the text.

16. Wellhausen (*Composition*³, 371) thinks that ver. 16 a contains a doublet. The truth is that the repetition is an original part of the narrative, and is intended to indicate the great excitement of the speaker, who had to repeat his words in order to make his meaning clear. This shows the consummate art of our narrator. We may note further the wonderful vividness of the whole passage, the nervous and rapid movement of the sentences, the effective use of the circumstantial clause, the variety and change of the tenses, and, finally, the artistic gradation of the events, leading up to a climax at the end of the passage.

18. וּתְכַרַּע. This verb seems to be intended to convey the idea that the birth throes came on suddenly without preparation or the aid of a midwife, even like the childbirth of wild animals; cf. Job 39. 3.

21. The subject of וּתְקַרֵּא is the mother, as of וּתְאָמַר in the next verse. Had the subject been, as the moderns hold, the women around her, the writer would no doubt have said וּתְקַרְאָנָה as in Ruth 4. 17 b. To argue from ver. 20 b, as H. P. Smith (p. 36) does, that the mother had already become unconscious, is to misapprehend the meaning of the narrator. What he means to convey is that the mother was so overwhelmed by the sense of Israel's calamity that even so joyful an event as the birth of a son could not distract her mind from the contemplation of the national catastrophe.

6. 2. Rashi correctly interprets באיזה ענין—במה 'in what manner?'; so Vulg.: *quomodo?* cf. Judges 16. 3. If the Philistines had known that they had to send back the Ark accompanied with a gift, and only asked what the gift

should be (במה = 'wherewith', as the moderns explain it after Pesh. ܕܡܗ), there would have been no need on the part of the priest to say אל תשלחו אותו ריקם (ver. 3).

19. The absence of the *copula* before חמשים proves that חמשים איש is a variant reading of שבעים איש. After this variant had crept into the text, a scribe inserted אלף to give the expression some sense, but luckily failed to supply also the *copula* to חמשים. The Versions, however, express the *copula*. So also in some MSS. and old citations. Cf. Aptowitzer, I, 42.

8. 2. The ancients already noted the difficulty that Samuel should have placed his sons at the extreme Southern frontier town of Beersheba. See *Babli Shabbat*, 56 a, and *Ḳimḥi* here; cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities*, VI, 3. 2. But the matter can be explained quite easily. Samuel did not resign his office to his sons. Had he done so, he would no doubt have placed them at Ramah or some other sanctuary in the centre of the land. He appointed his sons only to relieve him of work in the outlying districts, to which he could not attend personally owing to his old age. It may be noted in passing that Beersheba was a famous sanctuary, cf. Gen. 46. 1; Amos 8. 14.

8. The moderns, following LXX, insert לי after עשו and explain that the comparison is between this לי and לך at the end of the verse: 'As they have been accustomed to deal with Me, so are they dealing also with thee.' But this is a contradiction of the statement in the last verse that the people's demand for a king is not a rejection of Samuel. It is better to retain the reading of MT and to take with *Ḳimḥi* לך in the sense of עמך, and to interpret the comparison as being between the people's conduct in the past and in the present: as they have been accustomed

to act ever since the Exodus, so they are acting now unto thee, viz. in thy time.

9. 18. Targum (וארע) seems to have read וינש for וינש ; cf. 25. 20. Cf. the remark of R. Tanḥum (ed. Haarbrücker, Leipzig, 1844) on 25. 14.

20. שלשת הימים. The original reading was probably שלשה ימים. The ה in הימים is a dittography of the ה (an error for ה) at the end of the last word, or perhaps a correction of this ה.

24. For הנשאר read, with H. P. Smith and Nowack, הנ, being dittographed from the last word הנה (= הנה). Or, perhaps, we should read הנשר, the נ being a corruption of ב and א inserted to make sense. שים is a passive participle as in Num. 24. 21. For לאמר העם LXX has παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους = לאחרים. Hence I propose to read ואחר for לאמר. קראתי is a relative clause without אשר (cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*, § 155 f seq.). 'Behold the *flesh is set* before thee, eat thou (first), for unto (this) appointed time hath it been reserved for thee, and afterward the people (*whom*) I have invited.' In these words Samuel invites Saul, whom he has placed at the head of the table (ver. 22), to preside at the meal instead of himself; and he asks him to begin the meal, probably by pronouncing the formal benediction; cf. ver. 13. כי הוא יברך הובת אחרי כן יאכלו הקראים : 13. See *Babli Berakot*, 48 b, with Rashi.

10. 12. משם is difficult. LXX reads מהם. It is perhaps better to read מהעם, mentioned in last verse; cf. 14. 28. For אביהם Targum has רבהון, viz. in a spiritual sense; cf. 2 Kings 2. 12, &c.

25. משפט המלכה is the rights and duties of kingship in relation to the people, which Samuel settled and sealed before God, thus giving them the sanctity of a solemn

covenant. Cf. the covenant made by David on his anointment, II 5. 3. The critics assert that this משפט המלוכה is identical with משפט המלך in 8. 9, 11. But it is incredible that Samuel would solemnly invest the king with prerogatives of such a tyrannical nature as those catalogued in 8. 11–17. The enumeration of those royal imposts was only intended to frighten away the people from the institution of the monarchy; cf. R. Judah in *Babli Sanhedrin*, 20 b: לא נאמרה פרשה זו אלא לאיים עליהם בלבד.

13. 3. MT is correct. העברים are the Israelites who had permanently attached themselves as vassals to the Philistine; see 14. 21. This class is also referred to below in ver. 7, as opposed to איש ישראל of ver. 6. Cf. also Sayce, *Early History of the Hebrews*, p. 6.

13. The proposed pointing of לא as לָא = לוֹ (cf. Driver's note) is improbable, as proved by the repetition of the phrase in ver. 14 b. Further, it is not likely that Samuel would fail to state categorically at the beginning of his speech that Saul had broken God's command.

21. הפצירה means 'sharpening' or 'filing', parallel to ללמוש in the last verse. It is a verbal noun of פצר in its primary and physical sense of 'to press' (Gen. 19. 9), and hence 'to sharpen' or 'to file'. פים is an old Hebrew weight, and like שקל probably also a Hebrew coin. For ושלש קלשן read, with S. Raffaeli, ושלש השקל. The meaning of the verse is that the Philistines exacted from the Israelites the heavy payment of a פים for the sharpening or filing of ploughshares and coulter, and a third of a shekel for the sharpening of axes and for setting the goad. Cf. further the writer's paper in the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1915, p. 40 f., with the references given there; and E. J. Pilcher, *ibid.*, 1916, pp. 77 ff.

14. 4. סנה may be connected with the name of the tree

כנה. Targum has מדרוכיתא 'a treading', possibly connecting it with מכאני 'boots'.

5. מצוק is absent from LXX, hence the moderns omit it as a dittography of מצפון. This finds some support in the rendering of the Targum : מסתכיא מצפונא = מצפה מצפון (cf. also Aptowitz, *op. cit.* 21). On the other hand, the omission in LXX may be due to haplography, and the rendering of the Targum may be based on a corrupt text. That the word is not repeated in clause *b* is no proof of its spurious character, for neither is שן repeated. As for its meaning, מצוק may perhaps be connected, as H. P. Smith (p. 106) has noted, with the Mishnic צוק (*Yoma*, 6. 5; *B. meṣi'a*, 7. 10).

14. For מענה cf. *Mishnah Ohalot*, 17. 1.

16. It would be better to omit the article in ההמון, as suggested by Smith. The reading of LXX המהנה, which some moderns adopt, is incorrect, since, as the last verse shows, the panic was not confined to the camp. It may be noted that המון is used in ver. 19 in a slightly different sense. Here it means 'the crowd', but in ver. 19 it means the 'tumult' of the crowd.

25-26 a. The text is here certainly in disorder, but the emendation of the critics: הלך דבריו or הלך דברו for הלך רבש is much too ingenious to be correct. Further, it is exceedingly doubtful whether a Hebrew writer would have used such an expression. I propose to omit, with the critics, ver. 25 a as a doublet of ver. 26 a (note also הארץ in ver. 29 a), to insert יער—'honeycomb'—before רבש in ver. 25 b, and to point הלך in ver. 26 as a participle: הֹלֵךְ 'flowing', instead of הֶלֵךְ which is only found in the sense of 'guest' or 'wayfarer': ויהי יער רבש על פני השרה: (ver. 25 b). ויבא העם אל היער והנה הֹלֵךְ רבש (ver. 26).

47. For *ירשע* we should perhaps read *יירש* or *יוריש*.

48. *שסהו* is a synonym to Amalek. It is the Egyptian *Shassu*, the marauding *Bedawi* of the wilderness; cf. Sayce, *op. cit.*, pp. 171, 222.

15. 7. *מחווילה*. There is no need to change the text. The frontiers do not describe the extent of Saul's campaign. They only serve to define the defeated foe as one who habitually roamed about the vast area lying between Havilah and Shur.

23. For the active form *הפציר*, we should perhaps point the word as a passive, either *niph'al* *הפציר* or *hoph'al* *הפציר*, which would mean 'to allow oneself to be urged', to be persuaded, and hence 'to hesitate in obeying, to disobey', parallel to *מרי*.

32. *מערונית*. We should perhaps read *במערונית* 'in chains'; cf. Qimḥi, Ralbag, and R. Isaiah. The omission of the *ב* may have been due to haplography of the graphically similar *מ*. The rendering of LXX *τρέμων*, according to which many moderns point *מערניית*, is not in accord with the light-hearted temper of Agag as displayed by his contemptuous remark in clause *b*.

16. 5. Targum renders *בוכה* here and in ver. 3 by *לשירותא*, whereas *לובה* at the end of this verse it renders *לנכסת קורשא*. This seems to imply that the elders were invited only to the sacrificial meal, but not to the sacrifice itself, which was reserved for Jesse and his sons. This seems very plausible. The divine revelation came to the prophet at the performance of the sacrifice, and in his fear of Saul he did not wish strangers to be present when he made the choice of the new king.

11. *נכב* should be pointed as a *hiph'il* *נכב* in ac-

cordance with the Mishnic idiom; cf. Mishnah Berakot 6. 7, &c. See also Driver's note.

12. The emendation of עלם for עם is very improbable. For עלם should have preceded also the first adjective—ארמי. Further, it is not likely that the same scribal error would have been repeated in 17. 42. It is more probable that יפה is used in a substantival sense. So LXX *μετὰ κάλλους*; cf. the use of נבה in ver. 7, and Driver's note here. Targum omits עם both here and in 17. 42.

17. 19. This verse is an addition by the narrator. If it were, as some moderns (cf. Smith, p. 157) assert, part of Jesse's speech to direct David to the whereabouts of his brothers, its wording would have been . . . והמה עם שאול וכל . . . Further, the words נלחמים עם פלשתים would be quite superfluous in the mouth of Jesse.

34. Driver's remark in his *Notes*², p. 144, that the reading זה for שה has no manuscript authority, is incorrect. The reading זה was already before R. Joseph Kaspi (fl. 1280–1340). Cf. his remark: היותר נאות שהיה זה רמו לארי לבדו (היחזקאל, ed. J. Last, p. 20).

40. The genuineness of בכלי הרעים is proved conclusively by ver. 49, where the receptacle is referred to as הכלי, and not as וילקוט. Hence, I suspect that וילקוט is a gloss.

48. המערכה means here not the 'battle array', but the space occupied by the fighting lines. Such is obviously its meaning also in ver. 20.

19. 24. Targum renders ברשן—ערם = כחמול 'demented'; cf. Rashi. Probably the translator pointed ערם = ערום 'prudent', and regarded it as a euphemism for 'mad'.

20. 20. The emendation, based on LXX: ואני אשלש בחצים 'And I on the third day will shoot to its side with

arrows', can hardly be right. For apart from the questionable character of the Hebrew of this proposed sentence, the statement contained therein is not correct. Jonathan shot the arrows not on the third but on the fourth day, i. e. including, in accordance with ancient Hebrew usage, the day on which he was speaking. Cf. ver. 35: וַיְהִי בַבֹּקֶר, viz. the third day of the new moon. As the second day of the new moon is described in ver. 19 by וַיִּשְׁלַח, it follows that the third day could not also be designated by אֲשֶׁלֶּשׁ. It is, therefore, better to retain the reading of MT, and to explain צָרָה, with Rashi and others, as לָצַר. The accent should, of course, be shifted backwards to the penultima.

הַחֲצִים must be taken literally. For, as a matter of fact, Jonathan shot more than one arrow, against LXX and the moderns, as is proved by the verb וַיִּלָּקֵט in ver. 38, which would not have been used if only one arrow was to have been picked up. The form הַחֲצִי in vv. 36, 37 must therefore be regarded as a collective = הַחֲצִים, or as a contraction of הַחֲצִים.

21. קָחֵנו cannot be addressed to the lad, as the moderns interpret after LXX and Vulg.; for it would be quite superfluous after the command . . . מִצֵּא. Again, if קָחֵנו was addressed to the lad, it would have been repeated in the next verse. We must, therefore, conclude that קָחֵנו is addressed to David. The suffix refers, as Kimḥi rightly explains, to the lad. If the suffix referred to the arrows, as Rashi seems to imply, the form would have been קָחֵם. See last note. Further, there is no reason why David should be charged to pick up an arrow. The meaning is: You need have no fear to show yourself to anybody, but you may actually come back to me in the company of the lad.

21. 8. הרעים cannot be an error for הרצים, since, as is evident from 22. 17, 18, Doeg did not belong to that company. The use of אביר for שר or ראש may be of foreign origin like Doeg himself. LXX (*νέμων τὰς ἡγεμονίας*) seems to have read רעה הפרדים.

14. וישנו. The verb שנה may, perhaps, be used here with the Syriac *nuance* of 'to be demented'. See above on 19. 24.

22. 1. The moderns assert that מערת is a scribal error for מצודה. But it is incredible that this error should have been repeated in II 23. 13 and copied in I Chron. 11. 15 and in all the Ancient Versions. No doubt מערת is right. As II 23. 14 implies, מערה and מצודה are not synonymous. The latter seems to include the former. The מצודה seems to have been a fort on the hill, which served as a watch-tower and also, it would appear, as a residence for the captain. The מערה, on the other hand, seems to have served as a storehouse and as a place of retreat in time of danger. Thus in 24. 1 we find David dwelling in the מצודה. But when Saul comes to search for him, David and all his men are found in the recesses of the מערה (24. 4). On the departure of Saul and the disappearance of the danger, David and his men return to the מצודה (24. 23). Cf. R. Jonah Ibn Janah, *op. cit.* s.v. מצד, p. 270 f.

23. 6. The text of this verse is difficult. The rendering of LXX is only an expanded paraphrase to overcome the difficulty of MT. The best solution is to omit קעילה as a doublet from the previous or following verse, and to read with Targum (אחית)—ייר for הוריר.

24. מען cannot be right, for, as is shown by the next verse, David went to Ma'on only after Saul had arrived in Ziph. The reading with LXX, in ver. 25, of אשר for וישב

will not remove the difficulty. It is better to read here *מֵעַן* for *וַיֵּן*. The latter has crept in here from ver. 25, where it is found twice.

26. *עָבְרִים* is correct. Cf. the Midrash cited in Yalkuṭ and in the Hebrew commentaries: *אָמַר ר' אַבָּא הָקִיפוּ עָלָיו כֵּעָטְרָה*. So literally in Vulg.: *in modum coronae cingebant*. The emendation *עָבְרִים* is unlikely. Saul would not have attempted the more difficult task of *crossing* the mountain in order to effect the capture of the elusive David and his band. Targum renders *כַּמְנִין*, which may perhaps point to a reading *אֲרִבִּים*. Cf. Tanḥum's note *ad loc.*

24. 1. Driver in his *Notes* (second ed., p. 191) expresses surprise that David's going from Ziph (= Ma'on) to 'Engedi should be described as *וַיַּעַל*, seeing that 'Engedi is situated some 3,560 ft. below Ziph. But no doubt the verb *עָלָה* is used here idiomatically of going northwards, or, to be more precise, in a north-easterly direction from Ma'on to 'Engedi. Conversely *יָרַד* is used of going southwards towards the Negeb, irrespective of the level of the localities of departure and arrival. Cf. 23. 19, 20, 25; 25. 1; 26. 2, &c. Cf. Ibn Ezra, Genesis 38. 2: *הָבָא מִפָּאָת צִפּוֹן שֶׁל עוֹלָם לָרְדּוֹמוֹ הוּא יוֹרֵד*; and Exod. 33. 1: *הָהוּלָךְ לַפָּאָת שְׁמַאֵל עוֹלָה הוּא*. In 27. 8 *עָלָה* is used in a military sense, as in Judges 12. 3, &c.

3. Targum seems to have read *כִּיפִיָּא (= הסלעים)* for *הַיַּעֲלִים*. See also Kimḥi *ad loc.*

4. The phrase *לְהַסֵּךְ אֶת רִגְלָיו* is well explained in *Babli Berakot*, 62 b: *אָמַר ר' אֱלֵעָזָר מִלְמַד שֶׁכֵּךְ עֲצָמוֹ כְּסוּכָה*. As to the exact meaning of the euphemism, there is general agreement among the ancients that it describes the action of *ventrem purgare*; so Vulg.; cf. *Mishna Yoma*, 3. 2 (cited by Kimḥi): *כָּל הַמִּסֵּךְ אֶת רִגְלָיו . . . וְכָל הַמְטִיל מִים*. Kimḥi, however, explains it here as *לְהַשְׁתִּין מִים*, connecting *לְהַסֵּךְ* with the root *נָסַךְ*, and

רגליו with מגליהם, 1 Kings 18. 27 (Kerê). So Rashi in *Babli Yebamot*, 103a s.v. להסך, but here Rashi gives the first and, no doubt, more correct interpretation.

25. 14. Should we, perhaps, read וינער for ויעט ?

20. בסתר is rendered by Targum בסטר, no doubt through assonance.

22. משתין is rendered by Targum euphemistically : ידע = any one with knowledge, i.e. any human being ; cf. Rashi and Kimhi. Perhaps, however, Jacob Levy (*Chald. Wörterbuch*, s.v. ידע) is right in interpreting the Targumic phrase as any grown up male who knows sexual intercourse.

23-24. . . . ותפל . . . ותפל. Our text may be right : first she prostrated herself at a distance as a sign of respect, and then she threw herself at David's feet as a suppliant.

29. ויִקָּם is correct. It is incorrect to take it, as many moderns do, as a conditional, and to point ויִקָּם or to read וִקָּם, since his being persecuted was not hypothetical, but a hard fact. For אדם cf. 24. 10. With צרור החיים cf. ספר צרור החיים in Exod. 32. 32, &c. . . . יקלענה may have been a popular imprecation based upon some primitive belief. For כף הקלע cf. Rashi here and in *Babli Shabbat*, 151a.

26. 20. מוננר is best explained as equivalent to מרחוק ; cf. Ps. 38. 12 ; Amos 9. 3 : 'Far away from the Lord's presence', where it might not attract His attention to avenge me.

28. 12. The reading שאול instead of שמואל found in some MSS. of LXX and adopted by a number of moderns, is certainly wrong. The narrator would have said ותבר, instead of ותרא. Further, Saul's question in the next verse כי מה ראית and the woman's answer prove that the woman's

detection of Saul's identity was caused by something extraordinary in the appearance of the ghost. Cf. the well-known passage in *Tanḥuma* on Lev. 21. 1 cited here by Rashi and Ḳimḥi. See also Aptowitzer, II, 61.

13. עלים . . . אלהים, cf. Driver's note. The ancient Rabbis already explained the plural by the supposition that there appeared more than one spirit; see *Babli Hagigah*, 4 b, and *Tanḥuma*, *loc. cit.* I conjecture that the woman used the plural because she was not a believer in monotheism. She may have belonged to the aboriginal heathens of Endor, who survived the Israelitish conquest; cf. Joshua 17. 11-12; Judges 1. 27.

30. 5. Budde eliminates this verse, but without cogent reason. The wives of David were persons of too great importance to be lumped together with the nameless women of David's men. Hence they receive special mention both here and in the account of the rescue (ver. 18). Further the verse is intended to explain the cause of the excessive grief which David displayed equally with his men.

9b-10. The text is in disorder. והנותרים עמדו is out of place in ver. 9; and the order in ver. 10 should have been first clause *b* and then clause *a*: ויעמדו מאתים . . . הבשור, וירדף רוד . . . מאות איש. Budde adopts this order, and deletes והנותרים עמדו as a gloss, but he does not explain the origin of this gloss. It is possible, however, that the original text ran like this: וירדף . . . מאות איש והנותרים עמדו. By some accident והנותרים עמדו got transposed to the end of the previous verse, and in order to make sense the scribe inserted ויעמדו מאתים איש, as we have it in our text. Or, again, it is possible that the scribe had before him two readings:

נחל הבשור : (ver. 10) וירדף . . . מאות איש והנותרים עמדו (i) וכו' ; (ii) וירדף וכו' (ver. 10) : אשר פגרו וכו'.

The scribe accepted the second, though inferior, reading because it specifies clearly the number of the laggards, and relegated והנותרים עמדו to the margin, whence it eventually got into the text at the end of ver. 9.

17. For למחרתם we should read למחרתו, i.e. on the morrow of the day on which he had set out on his expedition. So Targum : ביומא דבתרווי ; and apparently LXX and Vulgate. Cf. also Aptowitzer, *op. cit.*, 65. The ם is a scribal error for the *waw* at the end of this word combined with a dittographed *waw* from the beginning of the next word (ו = ם). Cf. 15. 3 : והחרמתם ואת = והחרמתו ואת.

31. 11. Instead of ישבי the chronicler (1 Chron. 10. 11) has כל ישבי must have fallen out in his text of Samuel through haplography of the similar יבש. To make sense with the plural verb וישמעו he inserted כל.

II 1. 1. The construction of this verse is very awkward. The writer evidently wished to combine in logical sequence the three events of the death of Saul, the return of David from the expedition against the Amalekites and the arrival of the bearer of tidings from Gilboa, but he was unequal to the task. He, therefore, felt obliged to have recourse to the use of a circumstantial clause : ודוד שב וכו'. That this clause is not a parenthesis is shown by the fact that it forms the antecedent to the opening words of ver. 2. H. P. Smith (p. 256) holds that the original form of the verse was : וידי אחריי שב דוד מהכות . . . וישב דוד וכו', and that the reference to the death of Saul is an editorial adaptation to the present context. But it is unlikely that the original narrator would have chosen to begin this section with a reference to the comparatively unimportant episode of

David's fight with the Amalekites, instead of connecting it with the big event of Saul's death, an event which forms the pivot of the whole succeeding narrative.

6. Wellhausen's explanation of בעלי הפרשים is too ingenious to be true. No doubt Kimḥi is right in explaining the phrase as ראשי הפרשים והממונים עליהם. So LXX *ἡνέκτατοι*. For a parallel cf. בעלי רכב in the Zenjirli Inscription. See G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, No. 62, 10. בעל with the sense of ראש or שר is also found in the Punic phrase חרש ענברם בעל, *ibid.*, No. 45, 9.

9. The ungrammatical expression כל עור . . . בי is most probably a colloquialism.

12. The apparent tautology in על עם ה' ועל בית ישראל was already noted by R. Isaiah, who remarks: הוי"ו יתרה, meaning that על בית ישראל is epexegetical. But there is really no difficulty at all, for על עם ה' refers to the fighting men who fell in the battle fighting in the cause of the Lord (cf. I 25. 28, &c.), while בית ישראל refers to the non-combatants, particularly women and children, who were slain by the Philistines in their invasion of the Israelitish cities (I 31. 7). עם has the meaning of fighting men also in ver. 4 and frequently elsewhere. For the use of בית ישראל in this sense cf. the comment of *Mekilta* on Exod. 19. 3 (cited by Rashi, *ibid.*): בֵּיתָ יַעֲקֹב אֱלֹהֵי הַנָּשִׁים.

2. 15. The *war* in וָלֵאשׁ is a dittography of the preceding final *nun*. So also in וָבִאנִשִּׁי in ver. 31 below.

16. The critics, with their usual knack of blundering over the obvious, are much puzzled over הַצָּרִים. Some read after LXX הַצָּרִים or הַצָּרִים. But these twenty-four men did neither *lie in wait* nor *hunt* one another. Others propose הַצָּרִים; but there were no *besiegers* here. Others, again, emend הַצָּדִים, which they interpret as a play on the

preceding בצר, a most insipid *derash*. Our text is most certainly correct. The field was so named originally from the presence in it, or beside it, of certain sharp flints, but after the event described in the narrative, the name הצרים was connected with the sharp swords of the unfortunate young men. Cf. Rashi and R. Isaiah.

23. The Versions support the reading of our text : באחרי החנית. The difficulty of the phrase may be removed by pointing באחרי, as in Targum באחרי.

25. נבעה אחת is correct. The emendation נבעת אמה is most unlikely. For if the narrator meant to say that they stood on the hill mentioned in the last verse, he would have said simply הנבעה. Cf. also Driver's note.

3. 5. אשת דוד may be a later amplification of an original אשתו, as in 1 Chron. 3. 3. The names of other two wives in the list which are prefixed with ל are followed by a descriptive adjective. In the case of לענלה the writer was unable to supply any further description, and he simply wrote אשתו, which a later scribe expressed more explicitly as in our text.

7. I conjecture that רצפה was of non-Israelitish origin. Her name is connected with the Semitic divinity רשף, also written רצף; cf. למלקרתרצף, Cooke, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-7; and No. 150, 5. Further, her father's name איה is only found among the Horites, Gen 36. 24.

5. 6. For באערייתך Targum has הסירך. Accordingly we may perhaps emend בַּהֲסִירְךָ. The omission of the ב may have been due to haplography of the graphically similar final ה of the preceding word.

6. 3. The pointing of ואחיי as ואחיי is improbable. The narrator would surely have been able to add the proper name of Uzza's brother. The name אחיי may be a caritative

form of אהיהו. Cf. ישוי = ישוי (I 14. 49) = ישועל = ישבעל = אשבעל.

7. 11. The moderns, following LXX, omit the copula form ולמן. So already R. Isaiah, who observes . . . הו"ו יחר . . . שלא יוסיפו בני עולה לענותו כמו שעשו מן היום אשר צויתי שופטים. But this is unlikely, since Israel suffered oppression also before the period of the Judges, viz. in Egypt. And from ושמתי מקום, which refers to the conquest of Canaan, it is obvious that בראשונה must refer to the period before Israel had acquired a territory of its own. Hence it is necessary to retain the copula with ולמן; cf. also Rashi's note.

והגיד is a perfect consecutive like the preceding verbs by the birth of Solomon that He will make thee a house'.³ The reading of 1 Chron. 17. 10: ויאמר, or the modern emendation ומגיד involves too abrupt a change of tense.

19. תורת is perhaps an error for תורת: this, an expression of gratitude by means of words, is all the *thanks* which mortal man can offer to God (ver. 20), but even my words of gratitude are superfluous, since Thou, O Lord God, knowest Thy servant and the thoughts of his heart.

21. The reading עברך for רברך, as in LXX and 1 Chron. 17. 19, cannot be right. Such a claim by David for himself would be a flagrant contradiction of the statement in ver. 18 that he is not worthy of God's favours.

23. The words גוים ואלהיו seem to have been lacking in the original text of Targum, and to have been inserted in our text of the Targum from the Hebrew original. Cf. Kimḥi's comment. אלהיו is lacking also in 1 Chron. 17. 21.

³ Cf. the writer's discussion of this passage in this REVIEW, vol. IX, p. 47 f. (§ 92).

8. 1. האָמָה should perhaps be pointed הָאָמָה 'the nation' (Gen. 25. 16, &c.). Cf., however, Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 414, who offers an excellent explanation of the baffling phrase.

3. Targum (לאשנאה תחומיה) may have read להסיג for להשיב and interpreted ירו as a boundary sign.

8. The name ברתי may perhaps be connected with Aramaic ברות = Hebrew ברוש. LXX (καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν) connects it with the root ברה = ברר (cf. I 17. 8: ברו).

10. 12. The emendation ארון for ערי is unhappy. It would have been nothing short of blasphemy for Joab to say that they would by their strength save the Ark of God. Had the Ark been with them in this battle, Joab would have looked to the Ark to save the army rather than that the army should save the Ark.

11. 12. The moderns, following Lucian and the Peshiṭta, connect ומחרת with the next verse. Mr. S.A.Cook (*American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. XVI, p. 156) actually makes this emendation an argument against the integrity of the text. But this emendation seems to be quite wrong. For if David invited Uriah to eat and drink before him מחרת, i. e. on the third day since his arrival from the camp, then Uriah's departure would have been delayed until the fourth day, or after three nights, whereas David distinctly says that he would send him back on the third day = וּמָחָר אֶשְׁלַח, viz. after the second night of Uriah's stay in Jerusalem. The fact seems to be that Uriah's carousal at David's order (ver. 13) took place in the evening of his second night in Jerusalem, and as even in his state of intoxication he failed to go home to spend the night with his wife, David, frightened that he might learn in the king's household of his wife's visit to the king, sent him back on his fatal

errand immediately on the morning following this second night (ver. 14 = בבקר, viz. ומהר of ver. 12).

12. 6. The change of לא into לו is bad. The fact that the rich man had pity on his own cannot be made a reason for punishing him. חמל may have been suggested by וחמל in ver. 4, but is not parallel to it.

31. Targum renders ונרר יתהון בשוקיא = והעביר אותם במלכן, taking מלכן in the sense in which it is found in Jer. 43. 9. Cf. Driver's note. The emendation of והעביר for והעביר was already suggested by R. Joseph Kaspi (*op. cit.*, p. 36): המעם שצוים לעשות לבנים.

13. 9-10. The critics have met here with various difficulties. The *hapax legomenon* המשרת has troubled them, and some of them resolved to regard it as an old corruption of מחבת. But the occurrence of משרת in the Targumim (Lev. 2. 5; 6. 14; 7. 9; Ezek. 4. 3; 1 Chron. 23. 29) and in Mishnic Hebrew (Mishnah Hallah 4. 1; Yerushalmi Pesahim 29b) ought surely to be sufficient to protect it against this 'critical' scepticism. The emendation ותקרא את המשרת for ותקרא את המשרת is neither clever nor happy. The amorous Amnon, who was so eager to see the damsel do all the work herself and in his presence, would surely not have allowed the interference of the משרת. Again, some critics see an irreconcilable discrepancy between ver. 9 and ver. 10, and therefore adopt the usual remedy of relegating the offending ver. 10 to the margin as an interpolation (cf. Smith, p. 330). They argue, if the food was already set before him (ver. 9a) why does he ask her to bring it into the chamber? And how could 'the sick man' move from one room into another? The answer is, taking the second question first, that Amnon had only pretended to be sick, and that having achieved his object of getting

Tamar into his power, he had no need to continue further his dissimulation. As to the first question, Amnon asked her to bring the food into the *inner* chamber, in order to be removed as far as possible from the hearing of his attendants, who were probably standing just outside (ver. 9). He must have expected some opposition on her part, and therefore hesitated to carry out his design on her in the large and accessible room which had just been emptied of his friends and attendants.

18. The critics object to מעילים and emend מעולם 'from eternity' (!), or מעוללים 'from babes' (!). They argue that the מעיל was distinct from the כתנת (Exod. 28. 4). Exactly so; therefore the narrator has to explain how it was that Tamar wore for her upper garment a כתנת, which was usually an under garment: 'For so the daughters of the king were used to dress with a כתנת פסים as מעילים, or upper garments.'

14. 14. It is best to emend ישיב for ישא: '... And we are like waters poured out to the ground, which cannot be regathered; for God will not restore the soul to the body, therefore one should devise plans, so as not to banish from oneself him that is banished.' Cf. חשב נפש הילר, 1 Kings 17. 21. The meaning is: The dead cannot be restored to life again, and no amount of revenge on Absalom will bring Amnon back; so why lose Absalom also by banishment? וחשב refers to David, as already explained by Rashi and Kīmhi. The *athnah* should accordingly be moved forward to נפש, which should be pointed נֶפֶשׁ.

15. 8. The omission of בחברון at the end of the verse, supplied, however, by Lucian from ver. 7, may have given rise to the explanation recorded in *Babli Temurah*, 14 b, that Absalom's ostensible object in going to Hebron was

not to sacrifice there, but only to obtain lambs for sacrificing in Jerusalem.

12. It is generally assumed by moderns, and so already by Kimḥi on 17. 3 and Ralbag on 16. 23, that Ahitophel's enmity towards David was inspired by a desire to avenge the wrong David had done to Bath-sheba, whose father Eliam (11. 3) is supposed to be identical with Eliam son of Ahitophel, mentioned in 23. 34. But is it likely that an unprincipled and ambitious man like Ahitophel would have hated David for making his granddaughter the favourite wife in the royal harem? Moreover, by assisting Absalom in his enterprise, Ahitophel was actually endeavouring to rob Solomon, his alleged great-grandson, of the throne of Israel, the promise of which must by that time have already been made to him through Bath-sheba. Nay, it is very likely that it was this promise to Bath-sheba that drove Absalom to rebellion. It has always seemed strange that Absalom should have thought it necessary to take such violent measures for seizing forcibly what would have been in the natural course of events his rightful due within a few years. For it is evident from David's conduct in this narrative that the rebellion took place towards the end of David's reign, when he was already nearing his decline (cf. *Seder 'Olam*, ch. 14). Why, then, this fatal impatience on the part of the heir-apparent and his friends? The fact is that Absalom's conduct was actuated by the same motives as that of Adonijah a few years later, viz. to prevent the aged king from making good his promise to the son of his adulterous *parvenue* wife. But the crafty grandfather of that wife would surely not have taken the leading part in a conspiracy against her young son. We must therefore conclude that Eliam the father of Bath-sheba was not

Ahitophel's son. It is also probable that the narrator would not have stopped short in the pedigree of Bath-sheba at the mention of the comparatively obscure Eliam, had he been able to trace him further to such a famous personality as Ahitophel. Cf. also W. Jawitz, *תולדות ישראל* (1905), vol. II, p. 27, note. Wellhausen (*Composition, &c.*³, p. 258, note), with more than his usual display of cynical scepticism, remarks: 'Dass Davids Versprechen 1 K. 1, 13, 17 bisher nicht erwähnt ist, kann nicht befremden, da er selber und alle Welt nichts davon weiss. Vgl. 1, 14 ומלאתי את דברך.' But the critic has overlooked 1 Kings 1. 30, where David recalls his solemn oath to Bath-sheba. Nathan's promise to corroborate or supplement Bath-sheba's words only had reference to her statement about the doings of Adonijah, about which alone Nathan speaks in vv. 25-7. There is in Nathan's words no mention whatever of the king's oath to Bath-sheba, which no doubt was made in private.

19. I venture to express the opinion that the name אחי is a caritative form of אֲחִיָּה, parallel to עֲמֻנָאֵל. Similarly other personal names ending in י— may be caritatives of corresponding longer forms of theophorous names with the element ייה, as חושי = חושיה, parallel to מהרי = מהריה (23. 28). But this latter is more likely to be connected with מהר 'gift'; cf. the Punic מהר בעל, Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 108 f.) ; דורי (23. 9) = דוריה, akin to דוריהו = דוריהו (2 Chron. 20. 37 ; cf. Lucian, *ibid.*, Δουδίου), and ייריה = יריבי (23. 29) = יריבי (1 Chron. 11. 46) = יריביה, parallel to ירבעל and מריבעל ; and, perhaps, also ישי = ישיה. So also names ending in י—, like שבי (17. 27), cf. שבי (Ezra 2. 42) = שביה, parallel to שובאל (1 Chron. 23. 16, &c.) ; further בני (23. 36) or בני (Neh. 10. 16) = בניה, parallel to יבנאל and בניהו, and others.

17. 14. **וְכָל אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל** is obviously to be distinguished from **כָּל זָקֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל** in ver. 4 above. The mass of the people were, like Absalom himself, captivated by Hushai's deceptive eloquence. The elders, however, with their wider experience and greater intelligence, preferred Ahitophel's wiser counsel. Hence Hushai's fear lest Absalom should after all be persuaded by the elders to adopt Ahitophel's plan, vv. 15–16.

16. **כִּמְחִי** confesses his inability to explain the rendering of **יִבְלַע** by Targum **לְמַלְכָּא יִתְהַי**. Cf. also Levy, *Chald. Wörterbuch*, 202 b. It seems to the writer that Targum takes **בִּלַּע** in its ordinary application of swallowing food, and interprets it figuratively: 'Lest Ahitophel's counsel be tasty and savoury to the king', referring **לְמֶלֶךְ** to Absalom, as does also Rashi.

19. **הַרְפוּת** is rendered by Targum **דְּקִילִין**; similarly Lucian and Theodotian **παλάθας**. Perhaps they read **הַפְּרוּת** 'the fruit', spread out for drying in the sun.

18. 26. Most moderns point with LXX and Peshitta: **הַשָּׁעַר** for **הַשָּׁעֵר**. This is certainly wrong; for the narrator would have said **אֵל הַיּוֹךְ הַשָּׁעֵר**. Nor is the emendation of Smith (p. 36c) **עַל הַשָּׁעֵר** more happy. For the narrator would certainly have expressed it by **עַל אֲשֶׁר עַל הַשָּׁעֵר**. Further, why should this description of the watchman's whereabouts be given here at the fourth mention of his name, and not earlier in ver. 25? There is no doubt that the pointing of MT is correct. The watchman standing on the roof announced what he saw to the gatekeeper, who conveyed the news to the king. This latter operation is not mentioned explicitly by the narrator, either because its performance is taken for granted, or more likely because it was unnecessary, seeing that the king himself was

sitting within hearing of the watchman's voice (ver. 24 a). We must assume that the first announcement by the watchman (ver. 25) was also made through the gatekeeper. So we also find the four lepers announcing important news to the gatekeepers of Samaria, 2 Kings 7. 10, 11.

29. The text is, as already observed by Ehrlich, quite original. The incoherence of the reply of Aḥima'as is a deliberate artifice of the narrator to exhibit the messenger's great embarrassment.

19. 10. There is no reason to doubt the correctness of the form גִּרֹן. It is used here alone in a reciprocal sense, but in a passive sense it is frequent in Mishnic Hebrew. Cf. *Mishna B. Kamma* 2. 5; *Yadain* 4. 3, particularly with a preformative *hirek*: *Sanhedrin* 5. 6, &c. See the writer's remarks in this REVIEW, First Series, XX, 701-702 ('Mishnaic Hebrew', pp. 55, 56).

23. ידעת is correct. 'To-day I feel again as King of Israel, and I must not mar the joy of the day by acts of vengeance.' Cf. the similar remark of Saul, I 11, 13. Many moderns, following Lucian, read ידעתם: Do you not know that to-day I am king... and not *you*? But this does not explain the emphasis laid on היום (בי); nor does it suit the exclamation: היום יומת וכו'. The narrator would have made him say simply . . . היום לֹא יומת.

32-41. This passage has given much trouble to modern expositors. The apparent discrepancies between vv. 32 b, 34 b, 37 a, and 40 have forced them to interpret עבר as 'to pass on' in vv. 32, 37 and as 'to cross over' elsewhere in the passage; further to delete חירדן in ver. 32, and את חירדן in ver. 37, or to take חירדן as חירדנה, and אל חירדן as את חירדן; and, finally, to read with Lucian עמר חירדן in ver. 40. This obviously does violence to the

text, and is altogether unsatisfactory. The fact, however, is that, as stated explicitly in ver. 32, Barzillai *did* cross over the Jordan, and his leave-taking of the king must therefore have taken place on the Western side of the river. The above-mentioned discrepancies are only apparent and not real. Ver. 32 tells in a general way that Barzillai accompanied the king across the Jordan to take leave of him, and the following verses describe the incident in detail. While still on the Eastern side of the river, and before the crossing had begun, the king invited Barzillai to cross the river not for the purpose of leave-taking, but in order to go up to Jerusalem, and stay permanently in the royal court (ver. 34). Barzillai declines to go up to Jerusalem (vv. 35, 36), and only consents just to cross over the river but not to go farther (ver. 37 a), but offers to send with the king his son Kimham (ver. 38), which offer the king accepts (ver. 39). When this conversation was over, the crossing of the river began, and first the people went across, and then the king with Barzillai in his company. The king then took leave of Barzillai, and the latter returned across the river to his home in Gilead (ver. 40). Having finished relating the story of the king's leave-taking of Barzillai, the narrator proceeds to relate another, more important, incident in connexion with this royal crossing of the Jordan. For this purpose he repeats the fact that the king had crossed over and gone to Gilgal, taking the opportunity to mention that in accordance with the king's promise to Barzillai (ver. 39), Kimham accompanied the king to Gilgal; but, he goes on to relate, the king had not waited until the whole of Israel should assemble to escort him across the river, and had gone across with Judah and only a portion of Israel (ver. 41). This disregard of David

for Israel gave rise to an inter-tribal quarrel, which culminated in the rebellion of Sheba⁴.

41. The Kethîb ויעבירו is probably due to the recurrence of this form in the next verse. The reading of LXX (*διαβαίνοντες*) עברים, which the moderns adopt, is inadmissible. For since the king is already represented as being at Gilgal, the act of crossing with the king must be conceived as already lying in the past.

20. 3. The pointing after LXX אֶלְמָנוֹת חַיִּית is not right. 'Living widows' cannot by any stretch of imagination be identical with 'women treated as widows, whose husband is yet alive'. I conjecture that the right reading is אֶלְמָנוֹת חַיִּים 'widows for the whole term of their life'—lifelong widows, or, less likely, אֶלְמָנוֹת חַי 'widows of a living husband'. The corrupt ending in חַיִּית may be due to the influence of the ending in the preceding word אֶלְמָנוֹת. The whole phrase is perhaps an expression of a proverbial and colloquial character, in which grammatical niceties are often disregarded; cf. note on I. 9.

8. I propose to read ויֹאב הִגִּיר מִדָּו וְעָלָו חֶרֶב מִצְמַרֶּת. לְבָשׁוֹ is a gloss on מִדָּו, and הִגִּיר is a dittography of הִגִּיר, since the important fact which the narrator wishes to convey is not that Joab had on him a girdle, but that he had a sword over his military cloak. The point in this description, as already noted by Rashi and Ralbag, is that the scabbard with the sword in it was not, as usual, hanging down at his side vertically, but was joined across his loins horizontally, so as to facilitate its falling out of the scabbard at the inclination of the body and thus to give Joab, who would quite naturally stoop to pick it up from the ground, a naked sword in his hand without arousing in the mind of Amasa the least suspicion of foul

play (ver. 10 a). For **והוא יצא** we must, of course, read with LXX **והיא יצאה**, viz. the sword from the scabbard, which Joab immediately picked up with his *left* hand (= **ביר יואב**, ver. 10), so as not to arouse Amasa's suspicions, using his right hand for taking hold of Amasa's beard (ver. 9 b).

12. I propose with Budde to delete **כאשר ראה . . . ועמד** as an expanded doublet of the preceding **וירא האיש כי עמד כל העם**. The original of this latter clause may, perhaps, have been as follows: **וירא האיש כי עמד כל העם הבא עליו**.

13. Targum renders **הנה** by **אפניה**, pointing **הנה** = **הנהיה**; so Pesh. **הנה**. LXX also takes the verb in an active sense—**ἐφθασεν**. This is also the view of Ḥayyuj and Ibn Janah (cited by Kimḥi), and of R. Isaiah.

26. For **יאירא** Targum has **רמן תקוע**, thus identifying this **עירא** with the one mentioned below, 23. 26. It is possible, as Rashi and Kimḥi remark, that the interpretation **רמן תקוע** connects **יאירא** with **כמאר**, and regards it as synonymous with **תקועי** because of the abundance of oil in Tekoa, to which reference is made in *Babli Menahot* 85 b. This, however, shows a confusion of the Southern Tekoa with the town of that name in the North.

23. 32. The moderns agree to delete **בני** as a dittography of the end of the preceding word; to join **יהונתן** to the next verse, supplying **בן** before **שמה**, and to insert **היוני** after **ישן**, in accordance with the reading of Lucian **Ἰεσσαὶ ὁ Τουνί** for **הנוני** of 1 Chron. 11. 34. **הנוני** is identified with the Naphtalite family mentioned in Gen. 46. 24; Num. 26. 48. This identification is, however, improbable, since all the other heroes are drawn from the South, whereas Naphtali was settled in the extreme North. Instead of **הנוני** in

Chronicles, I would read הגמזוני, from גמזון near Ajalon on the border of Philistia, 2 Chron. 28. 18. On the same ground I doubt whether, after all, מצבה in ver. 36 is correct, since Zobah was situated in the far North, and in addition was inhabited, it would seem, exclusively by Arameans.